

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 11, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1-37 were pending, claims 10, 11 and 19-37 were withdrawn, claims 5-9, 12-14, 17 and 18 were objected to, and claims 1-4, 15 and 16 were rejected. By this Response, claims 1 and 19-37 have been canceled and claims 2-7 and 10-18 have been amended. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. Payment is included for 4 independent claim(s) in excess of 3 for which payment originally was made. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 1 and claim 18 for informalities.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, obviate the claim objections. Therefore, the objection to the claims may properly be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (US 7,180,100). Specifically, the Examiner deemed that claims 1-4, 15 and 16, and Figure 99 disclose the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are novel and unobvious. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should properly be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 5-7, 8-9, 12, 13-14 and 17-18 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17 and 18, and the claims that depend thereon, should be allowed.

Request for Rejoinder

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of withdrawn claims 10 and 11. Claims 10 and 11, as provided herein, depend upon allowable claim 5. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 should be found allowable.

Request for Interview

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033035M146.**

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: October 10, 2007

1130 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329